

REMARKS

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner states that the recitation of a “content of a foreign substance is 15 mg or less,” is indefinite since the 15 mg is not referenced to a standard quantity. Claim 13 has been amended to specify that the content of a foreign substance in the paste is “15 mg per 20kg or less.” This amendment is supported by the specification of page 25, line 20 through page 26 line 5.

Claims 11-14 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Singh. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner acknowledges that the reference does not recite the claimed paste production process, but asserts that applicants need to show that the “process limitations of the rejected claims necessarily produce pastes with patentably distinct properties from the pastes of the reference.”

Singh discloses pastes produced using typical roll milling. (See Singh column 3, lines 36-41). As described in the present specification, the use of conventional roll milling presents several problems. (See specification page 2, line 19- page 3, line 12). Among these problems is that the use of conventional roll milling results in the paste being contaminated with foreign substances from the surrounding work environment.

Applicants claim a paste produced using a roller provided in a cylindrical vessel. As the Examiner acknowledges in allowing claim 1-10, Singh does not disclose the claimed method of producing a paste using a cylindrical vessel. The contamination problem associated with the use of a typical roll milling process for producing a paste is shown by Comparative Examples 1-3 in the specification. As shown in Tables 1 and 2 of the specification, the use of conventional roll milling, as used in Comparative Examples 1-3, produced pastes that contained large amounts of foreign substances. Further, these panels had poor display characteristics because the panels produced using these pastes had many unlit portions due to the foreign substances.

In comparison, Examples 1-7 show pastes that were produced using the claimed cylindrical vessel. The pastes produced using the cylindrical vessel contained only small amounts of foreign substances and the panels formed using these pastes exhibited superior display characteristics. Accordingly, Comparative Examples 1-3 and Examples 1-7 show that the claimed process produces pastes with patentably distinct properties from the pastes of the reference. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 11-14 should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **360842010500**.

Dated: March 15, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By

Jonathan Bockman

Registration No.: 45,640

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7769